

occurs where those who get high scores are those who have the least integrity (fake the most)?

First, it is clear that applicants can fake their scores when instructed or otherwise sufficiently motivated to do so, just as they can with personality tests. Studies that compare individuals who are asked to respond honestly with those who are told to "fake good" reveal that, unsurprisingly, integrity test scores in the "fake condition" situation are higher.

Second, a problem with interpreting whether applicants *can* fake is that it does not tell us whether they indeed *do* fake. After all, job applicants certainly are not told to "fake good" when completing employment tests, and many applicants may not purposely enhance their responses out of moral reasons (they feel it would be wrong to enhance) or practical reasons (they believe enhancements would be detected). Unfortunately, there is much less evidence on this second question. As one review noted, "A generally unanswered question is whether job applicants actually do fake on integrity tests."⁹⁹

Finally, in terms of whether faking matters, if faking was pervasive, integrity test scores would either have no validity in predicting performance from applicant scores or have *negative* validity (honest applicants reporting worse scores than dishonest applicants). The fact that validity was positive for applicant samples suggests that if faking does occur, it does not severely impair the predictive validity of integrity tests. It has been suggested that dishonest applicants do not fake more than honest applicants do, because they believe that everyone is dishonest and therefore they are reporting only what everyone else already does. No matter what the reason, it does seem clear that if faking is a problem, it is not sufficient enough to undermine the validity of the tests.

Misclassification and Stigmatization. Some object to integrity tests because of applicants being misclassified as dishonest.¹⁰⁰ In a sense, this is an odd objection in that all selection procedures involve misclassification of individuals because all selection methods are imperfect (having validities less than 1.0). We think the larger issue is the possible stigmatization of applicants who are thought to be dishonest due to their test scores. These problems can be avoided with proper procedures for maintaining the security and confidentiality of test scores (which, of course, should be done in any case).

Negative Applicant Reactions. A meta-analysis compared applicant reactions to 10 selection procedures, including interviews, work samples, cognitive ability tests, and integrity tests. The results revealed that applicants react negatively to integrity tests—indeed, they rated integrity tests lower than all other methods except graphology (handwriting analysis).¹⁰¹ It is likely that applicants react quite differently to various kinds of integrity test questions, and that applicants' negative reactions might be mollified with explanations and administrative instructions. Unfortunately, there is little published research on these issues.